



DT 926


. P57

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00013987324





GRESS



GRESS THE L



GRESS THE L



GRESS THE L




GRESS THE L



GRESS















APR 18 1900

1038

L. C.


...THE...

# SOUTH AFRICAN QUESTION

## A Lecture

On "The Transvaal  
and Its System of Gov-  
ernment," with some of  
the abuses of power  
which have led to the  
present War in South  
Africa. Delivered by  
THOS. PHILLIPS.

PRICE, - FIVE CENTS



THE  
SOUTH AFRICAN  
QUESTION.

---

A LECTURE

On "The Transvaal and Its System of Government," with  
some of the abuses of power which have led to  
the present War in South Africa.

---

Delivered by MR. THOMAS PHILLIPS

at the Hall of the Liberal League, and published under  
the auspices of the

ANGLO-SAXON BROTHERHOOD.

---

COPYRIGHTED, 1900.

---

PHILADELPHIA, PA.:  
PRESS OF THE PHILADELPHIA JOURNAL  
1007 OAKDALE STREET  
1900

11

TWO COPIES RECEIVED.

Library of Congress,  
Office of the

APR 13 1900

SECOND COPY,

Register of Copyrights.

*a. 7850*  
*Mar. 26, 1900*

61467

The lecturer begs leave to acknowledge his indebtedness in compiling this address to Mr. Alleyne Ireland's article in "The Atlantic Monthly" for December, 1899; to Fitzpatrick's "Transvaal;" to "Oom Paul's People," by Howard C. Hillegas; to Mr. Thomas G. Sherman's contributions to "The New York Times;" and to Mr. James H. Stark's "British and Dutch in South Africa."

CT 926  
p57

# T H E SOUTH AFRICAN QUESTION

---

By THOMAS PHILLIPS.

---

In trying to place the Boer War in its true light, it is necessary to give some historical account of the legal and territorial relation the Boers sustain to Britain. The general opinion seemingly entertained as to that relation is far from according with facts, which, for want of time, I shall state in as few words as possible.

In 1795, during the war between France and Holland, Britain seized Cape Colony in the name of Holland. In 1802, Britain returned the colony to Holland, after peace had been restored. In 1806, the war between France and Holland again broke out. Then, in the name of the Prince of Orange, Britain again seized Cape Colony, and held it until 1814, when she purchased the colony, along with other pos-

sessions of Holland, for thirty millions of dollars. Hence, Britain was the rightful owner, not only by conquest, but by purchase, of the whole of Cape Colony.

The Transvaal Republic, so called, was founded by Boers, who left Cape Colony after that province had been ceded by Holland to Britain. Therefore, the Transvaal Boer was from the first living in British territory, subject to the flag and authority of Britain.

In 1834, owing to frequent conflicts between the natives and colonists, brought about by Boer slave raids, Britain was compelled to interfere, and paid the Boers \$15,000,000 to free their slaves. In 1836 and '37, about eight thousand Boers from Cape Colony settled in what is now known as the Transvaal and Orange Free State. In 1852, the independence of the Transvaal Boers was recognized; and the Orange Free State was established as an independent republic in 1854.

In April, 1877, the Transvaal was annexed to the British crown. Every member of the Transvaal Council signified in writing his willingness to serve the new government, with the exception of Paul Kruger, who, notwithstanding his declining to sign, drew his salary as a member of the Executive Council for eight months after annexation.

Shepstone, the British representative, was presented with numbers of addresses and memorials from Dutch, English and natives, praying him to take over the country, proving beyond a doubt that the body of the people desired to be under British rule. The only opposition consisted of Kruger and his friends, who kept up a disturbing agitation that led to the revolt of 1880.

During this agitation, the Boers friendly to Britain sought to be assured by the British Government that the annexation would not be revoked. This assurance was given by the British Government, through Sir Garnet Wolsely, who



proclaimed and made known in the name and on behalf of Her Majesty, the Queen, that it was the "will and determination of Her Majesty's Government that the Transvaal territory shall be and shall continue to be forever an integral portion of Her Majesty's dominions."

On another occasion Wolsely said, "so long as the sun shines the Transvaal will remain British territory." This was confirmed by Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Secretary of State for the Colonies, who directed Sir Garnet Wolsely to state from time to time the inability of Her Majesty's Government to entertain any proposal for withdrawal of the Queen's sovereignty. All this assurance was given at the request of native Boers.

One voice was raised against this. Gladstone denounced the acquisition of the Transvaal, and a month later came into power. He received a letter from Messrs. Kruger and Joubert praying that he would give effect to his sentiments by restoring the independence of the Transvaal. He replied "that the Queen cannot be advised to relinquish her sovereignty over the Transvaal." But on December 13th, 1880, in the face of this, Kruger and his associates proclaimed the South African Republic. The Boer war followed, which lasted until March, 1881. The British forces were defeated in several engagements. Large British reinforcements were on the way, and the Boers would soon have been outnumbered and overmatched, when Gladstone sent out to say that if the Boers would lay down their arms they would be accorded complete self-government, subject to British suzerainty.

The instrument restoring the Transvaal to the Boers was the Pretoria Convention, signed and published on August 3d, 1881.

## THE SOUTH AFRICAN QUESTION.

The natives in and around the Transvaal, eager to fight for the British, were kept back by the British authorities, who felt that the general interests of peace in South Africa would thus be imperilled. Large numbers of Boers and British fought with the regular troops, believing that under no circumstances would the Transvaal be given up. The position of these friends of Britain after the surrender was deplorable. Their grievances were eloquently set forth by C. K. White, President of the Committee of Loyal Inhabitants of the Transvaal, who wrote to Gladstone, but there was no reply recorded.

From the date of the signing of the London Convention there accumulated a mass of grievances of British subjects. In 1895, a petition praying for redress, signed by thirty-eight thousand Uitlanders, was presented to the Volksraad Boer Government, and was rejected with insult and ridicule. They were told that if they wanted any rights they had better fight for them.

On December 26, 1895, a manifesto was issued by the Transvaal National Union, in which the demands of the Uitlanders were stated. The principal demands were: First: The establishment of the republic as a true republic; a constitution framed by the representatives of the whole people. Second: An equitable franchise law, and the independence of the courts of justice.

After this came the Jameson Raid. Kruger solemnly promised after Jameson's men had laid down their arms that he would inquire into and redress their grievances. At length a petition signed by 21,648 Uitlanders was forwarded by the High Commissioner to Her Majesty, praying that she would intervene to secure just treatment for the Uitlanders, who, whilst paying five-sixths of the taxes of the state, had no voice in its government. The chief reasons for the peti-

tion were stated to be: First: The failure of President Kruger to institute the reforms promised after the Jameson Raid. Second: The continuation of the dynamite monopoly and its attendant grievance, notwithstanding the fact that a government commission, consisting of officials of the republic, had inquired into the matter and suggested many reforms. Third: The subjugation of the High Court to the executive authority, and the dismissal of the Chief Justice for his earnest protest against the interference with the Court's independence. Fourth: The selection of none but burghers to sit on juries. Fifth: The aggressive attitude of the police toward the Uitlanders. Sixth: Taxation without representation, and the withholding of educational privileges from the children of Uitlanders.

There is much could be said, historically, about attempts made by the British authorities to secure the recognition of the rights of the Uitlanders—all of which failed. It seems clear that the real core of the contention between Great Britain and the Transvaal Government was the question of suzerainty. The convention of 1881 granted complete self-government—subject to the suzerainty of Her Majesty—to the INHABITANTS of the Transvaal territory, upon certain terms and conditions, and subject to certain reservations and limitations. It is contended that these limitations did not refer to the suzerainty, but to the self-government. It was not to be unconditional self-government, but self-government with certain specified limitations, in addition to the general limitations of the Queen's suzerainty. There is no question as to the assertion of the suzerainty in the convention of 1881.

In regard to the convention of 1884: The Transvaal delegates requested the British Government to do away with the suzerainty by making the PROPOSED convention a TREATY between the two Powers. This the British Government

refused to do, on the ground that the Transvaal was NOT in fact an INDEPENDENT Power, nor was it intended that it should be represented as such. So the issue was definitely raised before the convention was signed, and the Transvaal delegates signed the convention knowing the position of the British Government on the matter.

Yet, in the face of this, in a dispatch dated May 9, 1899, the State Secretary of the Transvaal Government declares that no suzerainty exists. In reply, the British Government says, "the contention that the South African Republic is a sovereign international state is not, in their opinion, warranted by law or history, and is wholly inadmissible."—Dispatch from Chamberlain, dated July 13, 1899.

The general attempt on the part of the enemies of the Anglo-Saxon race, to represent Britain as depriving the Transvaal people of the benefits of self-government, and to substitute her rule for that of the people of the Transvaal, is contrary to historic fact. The origin of Britain's interference in the affairs of the Transvaal lies in the fact that everything implied in the grant of self-government to the INHABITANTS of the Transvaal has been persistently, insultingly and despotically withheld by a tyrannical oligarchy from the great majority of the inhabitants of the Transvaal, in violation of all treaties, in contempt of all petitions for justice and in defiance of the rightful authority of Britain.

Britain demands that the men who pay the taxes shall have a voice in the government; that the courts of justice shall be independent of the executive power; that the lives and property of the citizens shall be protected; that a man shall be tried by a jury of his peers. For this she is met with an ultimatum from the Boer oligarchy demanding—First: That all troops on the borders of the Transvaal shall be INSTANTLY withdrawn (an impossibility), while at the

## THE SOUTH AFRICAN QUESTION.

same time claiming the right to keep her armed forces on that same border, which means: "We will keep our forces in fighting position on territory which is not ours, and require Britain to withdraw her troops from her own territory." Second: That all British reinforcements of troops that have arrived in South Africa since June 1, 1899, be removed from the whole of South Africa, and while demanding this they retain the right to keep all the reinforcements which, in men and officers, they have collected in all parts of the world from among the enemies of Britain. Further: "That Her Majesty's troops which are now on the high seas shall not be landed in any part of South Africa; and that if all this is not complied with by Wednesday, October 11, 1899, not later than five o'clock, P. M., it will be regarded as a declaration of war and the Transvaal Government will not hold itself responsible for the consequences. Further: "That in the event of any further movement of troops occurring within the above-mentioned time in a nearer direction to our borders, it, too, will be regarded as a declaration of war."

This ultimatum constituted a declaration of war, which left the British people no choice but to meet it.

## CHAPTER II.

### CHARACTER OF BOERS.

From all that can be drawn from the action of Britain, there is nothing that can justify the conduct of the Boers. It cannot be successfully denied that the conduct of Britain has been that of patient forbearance and consideration for the welfare and rights of the people concerned, for which there is no parallel in history. Britain's consideration for the people subject to her rule has unfortunately been carried to an extent that has placed her empire in peril from which nothing but the expenditure of enormous treasure, and the heroic sacrifices of her sons, can save her.

The true explanation of the action of the Boers must be looked for in the character of the Boers themselves. Their history proves them to be tyrannical slave drivers of the most cruel and murderous type; in proof of which I will first give an extract from *Cyclopædia of History*, published by Tiffany & Co., Hartford, Conn., 1847, more than half a century ago :

"The cruelties practised on the native Africans by the Dutch—and that, too, with the sanction of the government—almost exceeds belief. When a party of Dutch wished to settle in any spot, they proceeded to clear it by putting to death the natives with as much coolness as an American squatter would exhibit in hewing down the forest trees to open a place for the erection of his log house, or in picking

off with his rifle a few of the wild animals which threatened to be troublesome. The Dutch manner of proceeding was summary. Having selected the hut of some poor wretch as an object for destruction, they first set fire to it. Let us imagine the dismay and horror of a poor family at finding flames breaking forth around and above them in every direction. Rushing forth, the wretched owners of the miserable dwelling would implore pity from their cruel enemies. The Dutchmen, or Boers, would be too much engaged in loading their pieces and discharging them upon the males to heed the cries of the females, who, with their children, were generally saved. The indifference with which the Boers regarded the death of the Bushmen is strikingly illustrated in the following anecdote: A Boer, presenting himself at the Secretary's office at Cape Town, after having traversed a lonely tract, was asked if he had not found the Bushmen troublesome; "Not very," replied he, with great coolness, "I only shot four."

When the British Emancipation Act came into force in Cape Colony, December 1, 1834, the Boers held nearly forty thousand slaves, and although Britain paid them fifteen millions of dollars for the release of their slaves, they were not content, but were still bent on the business of slave-holding. Pieter Retief, their leader, stated in his manifesto that the abolition of slavery was one of the reasons why his band was leaving the colony.

Notwithstanding an express agreement in the Sand River Convention, the Boers persistently practised slavery, and made a habit of raiding native kraals for the purpose of carrying off women and children. In proof, I give first from British Blue Book, C. 1876, published in 1877, which says, "Slavery has occurred, not only here and there in isolated

## THE SOUTH AFRICAN QUESTION.

cases, but as an unbroken practice, it has been one of the peculiar institutions of the country. It has been at the root of most of the wars."

Dr. Nachtigal, of the Berlin Missionary Society, wrote President Burgers, of the Transvaal, in 1875, "If I am asked to say, conscientiously, whether such slavery has existed since 1852, and been recognized and permitted by the government, I must answer in the affirmative."

A Dutch clergyman, named P. Huet, in a volume published in 1869, entitled "Het Africanische Republiek," says, "Till their twenty-second year they (the natives) are apprenticed. All this time they have to serve without payment. It is slavery in the fullest sense of the word."

In 1876, one year before the annexation, Khame, Chief of the Bagamangwato, sent a petition to Queen Victoria, in which he said: "I, Khame, King of the Bagamangwato, greet Victoria, the great Queen of the English people. I ask Her Majesty to pity me, and to hear what I write quickly. The Boers are coming into my country, and I do not like them. They sell us and our children. The custom of the Boers has always been to cause people to be sold, and to-day they are still selling people."

This testimony is enough to settle this question. They are not only slave-drivers, but usurpers and tyrants. When independence was granted to the Transvaal, it was on condition that there should be an equality of rights between the British subjects and Boer burghers. Kruger testified that such had been the case, and was emphatic in his assurance that there would be no change. He stated explicitly that as regarded burgher rights there was to be no difference made between British subjects and Boer burghers. That was the understanding upon which the convention was framed and



ratified, and it has been the persistent disregard of that condition which has led up to the present trouble.

No sooner had the Boers been placed in control, under the convention of 1881, than they began to consolidate the oligarchy which they are now fighting to maintain. This is proven by the laws they have passed, viz. :

1—A law of 1882, requiring strangers to have been for five years on the field cornets' books, and to have paid a fee of \$125, before they could vote.

2—Again in 1887 a law was passed making a fifteen years' residence and registration necessary to citizenship.

3—In 1891 a law was passed providing that no alien should be admitted to full citizenship except with the consent of two-thirds of the old burghers residing in the same ward with himself.

4—Another law was enacted, providing that all strangers must be furnished with passports; must have proof of their identity, and show that they are able to support themselves, and must also secure from the field cornets "residing and traveling certificates," renewable every three months.

5—Another law, known as "The Aliens' Expulsion Law," empowers the authorities to expel any foreigner from the country as a dangerous person, without trial, in the sole exercise of their discretion. This legislation proves beyond a doubt a settled purpose to keep all power in the hands of the oligarchy in control. Again, the foreign settlers in the Transvaal were denied all rights to bear arms, while every male Boer, from sixteen years and upwards, is heavily armed and drilled at the expense of the foreigners.

6—By a press law, passed for the avowed object of crushing the foreign settlers, all newspapers were placed at the mercy of President Kruger, who can suppress them at his pleasure,

7—By another law, passed for the same purpose, all meetings of more than seven persons in the open air are absolutely prohibited, while all other meetings can be dissolved in an instant, at the discretion of the police.

8—Another law was passed, absolutely prohibiting the presentation, by any foreigner, of even so much as a petition for redress.

9—When Kruger invited foreigners to settle in the Transvaal, full naturalization could be obtained within two years. After foreigners had accepted his invitation, he repealed all naturalization laws, absolutely. Then, under pressure, he restored the laws, but made the term fourteen years; but any foreigner desiring naturalization must renounce all protection, even from his own government or the Boer Government, for fourteen years, during which time he would be a citizen of no country whatever, and have no rights which any Boer would be bound to respect.

During these fourteen years, he must be ready to serve in the Boer army on twelve hours' notice, and he would be frequently called to serve, without pay, clothing, or even food, which he must provide for himself. At the end of these fourteen years of degrading humiliation, he would not be allowed to vote for any office worth voting for, unless his humble petition was approved by two-thirds of his Boer neighbors, by the military chief of his district, and finally, by Kruger himself. Neither would he be allowed to vote even then unless he was forty years of age.

In 1844, Kruger was in London, too poor to pay his hotel bill, which was paid by a generous Englishman. This is when he invited British and Americans to settle in the Transvaal, to conduct mining there, which they did, and built up the country.

## THE SOUTH AFRICAN QUESTION.

Kruger afterwards sold one of his own farms to Englishmen for \$500,000, paid in gold. His friends and neighbors sold other farms to English, Germans, Frenchmen and Americans for many millions of dollars. Every dollar of the wealth now possessed by Kruger, his son-in-law, his officials, and indeed any part of the Transvaal population, has been produced by the settlers.

The taxes levied annually exceed \$20,000,000. Nine-tenths of this amount have been collected from the foreign settlers, whom Kruger invited into the country. No appreciable part of these taxes is expended for the benefit of the foreign settlers. If this sum were equally divided among all the Boers it would furnish an annual income of about \$2,000 for each family, which would pay three times over all their living expenses. No such division is made; but half of these taxes have been spent in making preparations for war, and the other half devoted to the payment of enormous salaries to and jobs for Kruger, his sons-in-law, and political supporters. Kruger himself has annually received \$35,000 a year salary, while on repeated occasions sums of \$15,000 and \$25,000 have been paid out of taxes for his direct and exclusive benefit, as appears by public records. How much more has been spent without public record can only be guessed.

His son-in-law and private secretary possesses (so says Mr. Hillegas) a single house costing \$250,000 and rolls in wealth besides, as he must, to support such a house.

The official records in a Transvaal law-suit, arising upon a quarrel between two sets of Boer plunderers, show that every Boer official worth bribing, including Kruger's son-in-law, received bribes from a Boer railroad company. The amount of each bribe was set forth in a bill of particulars filed in open court. Not one of these men ever denied the receipt of these bribes.

## THE SOUTH AFRICAN QUESTION.

The foreign settlers, exclusively, built Johannesburg, a fine town of some fifty thousand inhabitants. They were not merely denied any right to govern that city, they were denied any municipal government whatever. This is proven, not only by the explicit statements of Mr. Hillegas, the American representative of the Boers, but also by a proclamation of Paul Kruger himself, dated in January, 1896, a copy of which is in the possession of Thomas G. Sherman, a well-known writer on the Single Tax, in New York City. Mr. Hillegas states that not \$5.00 could be expended in repairing a road or bridge without first receiving express authority from Pretoria.

Kruger resisted the introduction of railroads for years, in order to compel the miners to hire his private ox-teams at enormous prices. When finally he did permit railways to be built, he granted the privilege exclusively to persons who would agree to give to his relations a big share of the profits. He granted monopolies of several indispensable articles of supply to the miners, with the result of doubling the price at which they could otherwise be obtained. The whole Transvaal Government was corrupt from top to bottom. No business could be done with them without bribing the President's son-in-law and hangers-on.

Having remonstrated against these things for many years in vain, and having received frequent promises of reform which were never kept, and were never meant to be, a number of foreign residents, including more Americans, in proportion to their total numbers, than of any other nationality, conspired together to compel these reforms to be granted by force of arms. They collected rifles, gunpowder, etc., but never made any use of them and never committed any overt act. Their offences were such as could not have been punished in the United States with more than a short term of

imprisonment, or fines not exceeding \$1,000. They neither planned nor desired to become a British colony.

The conspiracy being discovered before the conspirators carried it out, sixty of them including six Americans, were arrested, cast into an indescribably filthy jail, and informed that unless they pleaded guilty they would all be hanged, but if they did plead guilty they would be let off with fines. Being brought into court, they were charged with an offence which, by the express statute law of Boerdom, was punishable with nothing more than a short term of imprisonment. Being assured by the Boer prosecuting officer that they would receive no greater sentence than this, and would be allowed to escape with fines if they pleaded guilty, they did so plead, although as to many of them, the offence could never have been legally proved.

No judge then on the bench being quite unscrupulous enough to serve Kruger's turn, he imported an utterly unscrupulous judge named Gregorawiski. This judge publicly stated that he came for the express purpose of "making it hot for the Uitlanders." After the prisoners had all pleaded guilty, this judge announced that, as to the four leaders, he would not sentence them under the statute law, but would resort to the unwritten law of the Transvaal, which prescribed death for such an offence. Accordingly, he sentenced these four (one of them was a distinguished American, and probably the ablest mining engineer in the world), to death, and all the others to various terms of imprisonment and heavy fines.

Even the Dutch settlers of South Africa, being horrified at this sentence, and pouring, by hundreds, into Pretoria, to remonstrate against it, Kruger graciously took the matter into consideration, but announced that his religious scruples forbade that he should commute the death sentence into fines,

## THE SOUTH AFRICAN QUESTION.

because such fines would be "the price of blood," and his reverence for his dear Lord Jesus forbade that he should be less scrupulous than the priests of Jerusalem.

The pious Boers, therefore, informed the prisoners that they could not be released on the payment of any fines, but if the prisoners would of their own accord offer to "subscribe to charities" sums ranging from \$25,000 to \$100,000 each for the leading men, and not less than \$10,000 for anybody, the merciful President might be induced to pardon them without any fines or imprisonment. Both the British and American Governments being at that time unwilling to interfere, this offer had to be accepted. The American citizens all made heavy contributions to "charity," Mr. John H. Hammond paying \$100,000.

These charitable contributions amounting to about \$1,000,000 in all, were duly paid over to His Highness Paul Kruger, or his son-in-law. It is needless to say that the charities have never turned up, although four years have now elapsed since the \$1,000,000 was safely deposited under the control of the pious Paul Kruger.

Both the British and American Governments meekly submitted to these outrages upon their citizens, and, in the language of Thomas Sherman, "more shame for them both." No wonder that Kruger described both Englishmen and Americans as "dogs, who, if they were good would lick his boots."

At last Britain has undertaken to vindicate the rights of her citizens, and in so doing, is vindicating the rights of the citizens of America, and is entitled to their sympathy and gratitude.

All attempts that are being made to represent Britain's quarrel with the Boers as one of conquest for the possession of mines, etc., is rot of the first water. To begin with, the terri-

tory, with its mines, is hers. It is open to investment of the world's capital. Britain's investments therein are small compared with those of France and Germany, but if she wants the mines she has the money to buy them. In all this business she opens the door to all nations alike, and asks no favors. The question is not one of material interests. The question is to-day whether the Boer oligarchy, with all its despotism and disregard of human rights and liberal constitutional government, shall drive the British race, with all which that race represents, out of South Africa.

Joseph Chamberlain, having charge of Britain's colonial affairs, has proclaimed before the whole world that "Britain is fighting for the equal rights of all men on British territory."

No one can show that Britain is waging war for any purpose but in defense of her own flag, which has been attacked, and her own territory, which has been invaded, and to uphold the equal rights of all the inhabitants.

An American newspaper says, "Britain's war is a battle for enlightenment and civilization, for the extension of law and order, stable government that will protect the person and property of all classes and conditions alike. Her battle is the battle of humanity, of law, of justice, and there can be no end of the war until English supremacy shall have been asserted and confessed by the Free State and Transvaal Republics. There is no intelligent and dispassionate citizen of this country who does not confess that wherever the English flag and English authority have entered the lines of the barbarian civilization has erected a new altar, and its beneficent fruits are visible to the whole world."

But the question as to what Britain is fighting for has been well put by Lord Salisbury, as Prime Minister, representing the Empire. He has proclaimed that the British Government has not received one dollar from South African

mines; that the object of the war is to uphold the flag and to vindicate the equal rights to self-government of men of every race and color; that the government's sole interest was to secure good government for the people of South Africa.

This declaration from the highest representative of the British Empire is the most important ever made in history. It virtually pledges the greatest empire that ever existed to the working out of the democratic principle. It is a magnificent declaration of radical human rights. It is a proclamation that the great Anglo-Saxon, or British race, are, on a world-wide scale, the champions of the rights of man, backed by the whole force and authority of the British Empire; that the rule of aristocracies, popes, and kings, by Divine right, is no more, but that the people, the whole people, and nothing but the people, under British rule, are supreme.

This is the issue of the hour. The general hatred hurled so fiercely at the British race is the result of the exhibition of this spirit in their past history. From the earliest times, the true Britain has contended for self-government. The battle against papal rule proves it; the conflicts against kings tell the same story. The old land has driven out and dethroned more kings than any other nation on the globe. The struggle against Charles the First gave the fatal blow to the Divine right of kings. It was that war which opened the way and made it possible for the American Republic to be established.

It was men of that race, they who brought Charles to the block, and afterwards gave a constitution to William of Orange, that on this continent stood out against George the Third, that laid the foundations of this republic. It was the descendants of the men who fought with Oliver Cromwell, that stood and fought for the right at Lexington and Bunker



Hill, and fought on, with the help of French republicans until Saxon George was victorious at Yorktown.

It was in England that the great contest for representative government was fought out and established. Every parliamentary rule known in legislative bodies originated in the British House of Commons. She is known as the mother of free commonwealths, and her sons are filling the earth with republican institutions. This is why despotic governments are ever ready to strike her down.

This, as the London Times says, "explains the bitterness of feeling against her in Germany, the ruling classes being Tories of the reign of Charles the Second, if not royalists of the reign of Charles the First. They devoutly believe in royalty by right Divine, and an hereditary and territorial nobility, the support and ornament of the throne. Liberalism in all shapes is abhorrent to them, but of all the forms of liberalism, they most cordially detest the system of constitutional government as developed in this country since the beginning of the century. They detest it because they fear it. It reconciled order and liberty. They have forgiven Russia for assisting Napoleon to dismember Prussia, in consideration of her devotion to monarchical principles and her resolute opposition to popular rights and to constitutional government."


It is this long fight with all forms of despotism which has made the Anglo-Saxon disliked. His championship of representative government, of liberty of thought, and freedom of trade, has made him a world of enemies. In every field of industry, in every workshop and factory, all through society, he is singled out as a target at which is hurled the poisoned darts of malignant hate on the part of the slaves and sworn supporters of political and theological despotism. He is surrounded by hordes of enemies bound by solemn

oaths to extirpate him from the earth, they pursue him everywhere and strike him in every form, both in the light and in the dark; they strive to keep him from all positions and rob him of all chance to earn bread. No man is so much criticised, insulted, ostracised and outlawed. Unprotected and outnumbered, he is turned out of court because he is a friend of liberty.

His success in opening up the world to liberal institutions has led to war, in which the fate of those institutions and the standing of the British race are involved. The forces of despotism have been marshalled in battle array against Britain, because they know that in the success of Britain's soldiers British cannon will sound the death-knell of oligarchic despotism. A world-wide conspiracy, in the spirit of the Holy Alliance, which Britain once defeated, is actively at work in the hope that in Britain's defeat the forces of constitutional liberty may be overthrown.

In this state of affairs, a Nelsonic call to duty runs along the line demanding the formation of an ANGLO-SAXON BROTHERHOOD, embracing the whole British race the world over, to maintain what their forefathers won, and to meet in the spirit of their fathers, this new "Holy Alliance," with an overwhelming defeat so effectual that it may never again raise its monstrous head, or evermore be kindled into life to enslave mankind.







# The Anglo-Saxon Brotherhood

Meets at

SCHUYLER'S HALL, 6th and Diamond Sts.

Every Sunday at 2 P. M. and Every Thursday Evening at 8 o'clock



The purposes of this Brotherhood, as announced in its Preamble, are the drawing together in closer communion of all persons of Anglo-Saxon or British lineage, whether born under the protection of the glorious old banner that's "braved a thousand years the battle and the breeze," or under the bonnie blue flag of Columbia, destined, no doubt, 'ere long to share with each other the empire of the seas.

The Brotherhood requires of candidates for admission no declaration of religious beliefs or political affiliations other than those covered by its Preamble, and in putting the admission fee and the monthly dues at the very modest figures of twenty-five and ten cents respectively, enables all Anglo-Saxons, irrespective of financial status, to an equal share in its benefits and an equal voice in its councils.

To all of our race we extend a hearty invitation to join, and assist in making this Brotherhood what we believe it will become, viz., "second to none" in numbers, intelligence or influence.

For the convenience of those residing at a distance we are now prepared to organize Branches, and grant subordinate Charters, and we earnestly request the members of the Sons of St. George, the Caledonian Societies, the American Protestant Association and all kindred societies, to visit our meetings or correspond with the Recording Secretary, who will be pleased to furnish any desired information.

ALFRED D. MORRIS,

Recording Secretary.

2708 W. Lehigh Avenue, Philadelphia.

H 291 129 H 201-79































Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.  
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide  
Treatment Date: June 2003

**Preservation Technologies**

A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION  
111 Thomson Park Drive  
Cranberry Township, PA 16066  
(724) 779-2111



SEPT 79



N. MANCHESTER,  
INDIANA 46962

